

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Patent Application No. 09/900,674

Applicant: Nyhan, et al.

Filed: July 6, 2001

TC/AU: 3623

Examiner: Van Doren, Beth

Docket No.: 211367

Customer No.: 23460

APPELLANTS' AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In support of the Notice of Appeal filed by Appellants on December 26, 2007, and in response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed on October 22, 2008, Appellants submit this Amended Brief including a summary of dependent claim 15 and *removing all status identifiers and canceled claims from the Claims Appendix*. Appellants submit that MPEP Section 1205.02 requires only removal of underlining and strikethrough markings. However, Appellants have deleted the status indicators and all cancelled claims in accordance with item 10 of the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief.

Real Party In Interest

The patent application that is the subject of this appeal is assigned to Dynamic Logic, Inc.

Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no appeals or interferences that are related to this appeal.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5-17, 21-24 and 26-33 stand finally rejected, and these rejections are presently being appealed.

Claims 2, 4, 18-20, and 25 stand presently canceled.

A complete listing of these claims appears in the Claims Appendix.

Status of Amendments

There were no amendments submitted after the final rejection.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3, 5-17, 21-24, and 26-33 are pending. The summaries of the identified claims reference the specification and drawings of Nyhan et al., U.S. App. Serial No. 11/004,074 filed on December 3, 2004.

Appellants' invention, recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 17, is directed to a method for conducting an on-line survey presentation process. The solicitation aspect of the survey presentation process is driven by additional executable instructions inserted into on-line *ad blocks* received, by a user computer, from an ad server in association with processing a previously received web page. The recited steps facilitate tuning a survey invitation process, through additional instructions contained within blocks of data downloaded from ad servers separately from web pages (containing references to the downloaded ads), to avoid excessive repeated presentation of on-line survey solicitations on a same user computer.

Turning to **claim 1**, the claimed method is directed to conducting an on-line survey in association with presentation of an on-line advertisement by a browser client (see, FIG. 2, browser 26, and page 7, lines 8-12). The sequence of recited steps begins with receiving a web page containing an on-line advertisement by a user computer including the browser client. See, FIG. 1, Step B, page 4, lines 26-31.

Thereafter, the claimed method proceeds through a request/response transaction between the user computer and an ad server. More particularly, the user computer, in association with processing the received web page, issues a request to the ad server for a block of data comprising executable instructions for presenting an on-line advertisement via the browser client. See, FIG. 1, Step C, page 4, line 29 to page 5, line 6.

The ad server thereafter “provides” the requested block of data. See, FIG. 1, Step H, page 5, lines 22-25. The advertisement data block includes, in addition to instructions for displaying an on-line ad, additional computer-readable instructions that carry out a decision-making process for determining whether to present an on-line survey *solicitation* via a browser client on the user computer. See, FIG. 1, Step H, page 5, lines 22-25.

During the recited “accessing” step, a timestamp on the user computer is accessed. The timestamp is indicative of a period of time that has passed since the on-line survey solicitation was previously presented by the browser client. FIG. 1, Step E, page 5, lines 9-11 and lines 19-21.

Continuing with the recited steps of claim 1, according to the last recited step if the time stamp indicates passage of at least a prescribed wait period between consecutive presentations of on-line survey solicitations, then the “additional computer-readable instructions” (see the “providing” step described above) are executed to determine whether to present an on-line survey solicitation. The “additional computer-readable instructions” in the illustrative example include a random number generator that renders a number used to determine whether to issue the survey solicitation to the current user of the computer 10. See, FIG. 1, Step I, page 5, line 25 to page 6, line 2.

The method recited in claim 1 thus includes at least a second decision making step facilitated by the “additional computer-readable instructions” contained in the block of data provided by the ad server during the “providing” step. The second decision making step occurs *after* first establishing that a “timestamp value indicates passage of a period of time ... between consecutive presentations of the on-line survey solicitation.”

Dependent **claim 6** recites three additional steps. The first step recites presenting the on-line survey solicitation thereby soliciting the user to take the on-line survey. See, FIG. 1, step J, page 6, lines 13-18. The second step recites generating, in association with the presenting step, cookie data including the timestamp value to indicate that the on-line survey solicitation was presented by the browser client. See, FIG. 4, steps 134 and 136, and page 10, lines 11-15. The third step recites sending the generated cookie data over a computer network to the browser client. See, *Id.*

Dependent **claim 7** recited the following additional two steps relating to executing the additional computer-readable instructions. The first additional step recites referencing a frequency parameter that influences the frequency of presenting the on-line survey

solicitations. See, FIG. 1, step I, page 6, lines 3-15. The second additional step recites determining whether or not to present the on-line survey solicitation via the browser client based, in part, on the frequency parameter. See, *Id.*

Dependent **claim 8** recites the method of claim 7 further comprising wherein the on-line survey solicitation is presented as part of a campaign, wherein the frequency parameter has a value that is at least partially a function of an amount of time remaining in the campaign, the method further comprising calculating the value of the frequency parameter according to an algorithm that incorporates the amount of time remaining in the campaign. See, page 8, lines 14-23.

Dependent **claim 11** recites the following additional steps. The first additional step recites presenting the on-line survey solicitation as a pop-up window. See, FIG. 4, step 144, and page 10, lines 24-29. Claim 11 further recites the further step of, in response to activation of a link within the pop-up window, sending a web page to the browser client comprising questions regarding a product or service advertised in the on-line advertisement. See, page 11, line 22 to page 12, line 16.

Independent **claim 13** is similar to method claim 1. However, the initial "receiving" step is described in terms of an action performed by an *advertisement server* (e.g., ad server 14 of FIG. 1) in contrast to the "receiving" and "issuing" steps recited in **claim 1** that are performed by a user computer. In particular, claim 13 is directed to a method for soliciting a user of a user computer (FIG. 1, computer 10) to take an on-line survey. The user computer is linked to a computer network (FIG. 1, network 18) and running a browser program (FIG. 2, browser 26). The recited method includes the step of receiving, by an advertisement server, a request issued by the browser for one or more files comprising an on-line advertisement. See, FIG. 1, Step C, page 4, line 26 to page 5, line 6.

Thereafter, the advertisement server provides, to the user compute in response to the request issued by the browser, the one or more files comprising the on-line advertisement, and in addition include further computer-readable instructions that facilitate decision-making steps for determining whether to present an on-line survey solicitation via the browser. See, FIG. 1, Step H, page 5, lines 22-25.

The claimed method further comprises the step of accessing, on the user computer, cookie data for the browser. The cookie data includes a timestamp regarding previous

presentation by the browser of the on-line survey solicitation. FIG. 1, Step E, page 5, lines 9-11 and lines 19-21).

The recited method further includes the step of executing the *further computer-readable instructions if the timestamp value indicates passage of a period of time* satisfying a prescribed wait period *between consecutive solicitations* on the user computer to take the on-line survey. The “additional computer-readable instructions” in the illustrative example include a random number generator that renders a number used to determine whether to issue the survey solicitation to the current user of the computer 10. See, FIG. 1, Step I, page 5, line 25 to page 6, line 2.

Dependent **claim 15** recited the additional steps of: (1) displaying the on-line advertisement (see FIG. 1, page 5, lines 27-28), and (2) deciding whether or not to solicit the user to take the on-line survey based on a frequency parameter, the frequency parameter being indicative of a probability that, in response to the selectively modifying step, the on-line survey solicitation will be submitted for presentation by the browser. See, FIG. 1, step 1, page 6, lines 3-15.

Independent **claim 17** is directed to a system including a set of components for carrying out the steps recited in claims 1 and 13. Claim 17 recites a system for conducting an on-line survey. The claimed system includes a client computer for interacting with a user. See, e.g., FIG. 1, Computer 10 and User 8, and page 4, lines 4-5. The system also includes a web server in communication with the client computer. See, FIG. 1, Web Server 12, page 4, line 5. The system also includes an advertisement server which supplies advertisement blocks in response to request instructions embedded in Web pages downloaded from the Web server. See, FIG. 1, Ad Server 14, page 4, lines 5-6. The system also includes a survey logic server in communication with the client computer. See, FIG. 1, Survey logic server 16, page 4, lines 6-7.

The claimed system also includes computer-readable instructions executed on the above-mentioned networked computers for performing a set of steps. The recited steps include requesting a web page to be sent from the web server to the client computer, the web page including a reference to an on-line advertisement to be presented on the client computer. See, FIG. 1, Step A, page 4, lines 24-26. The instructions also facilitate requesting, by the client computer, the on-line advertisement from the advertisement server for presentation on the client computer. FIG. 1, Step C, page 5, lines 3-5. The instructions also facilitate sending

an on-line survey solicitation associated with the on-line advertisement *from the survey logic server* to the client computer based at least in part on a stored timestamp value on the client computer indicative of a period of time that has passed since a previous presentation of the on-line survey solicitation on the client computer. See, FIG. 1, Step E, page 5, lines 9-11 and lines 19-21); FIG. 1, Step I, page 5, line 25 to page 6, line 2; and FIG. 1, Step J, page 6, lines 3-19.

Independent claim 32 recites that a random number generated by the user computer is appended to a URL used by a browser on the user computer to contact the survey logic server. See, page 10, lines 2-10.

Grounds of Rejection to be reviewed on Appeal

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal are the grounds stated in the Final Office Action mailed on August 24, 2007.

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 11-17, 26-27, and 33 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Smith et al. U.S. Pub. App. 2002/0128898 (Smith) in view of de Ment U.S. Pat. No. 6,728,755 (de Ment).
2. Claims 8-10, 21-24, and 28-32 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Smith in view of de Ment and Winn U.S. Pat. No. 6,901,424 (Winn).

Argument

The Final Office Action's rejection of each of the presently pending claims is premised upon multiple misapplied teachings from the prior art. The combined teachings of the prior art upon which the Final Office Action relies do not disclose *each of the recited elements* recited within the independent claims. The Final Office Action has thus not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the presently pending independent claims, and the current rejections should be reversed.

Appellants note that the teachings of Smith differ fundamentally from the presently claimed invention. In particular, the claimed invention is directed to avoiding excessive presentation of *solicitations to take an on-line survey*. On the other hand, Smith discloses a system for selecting a particular survey for presentation to a user – including use of cookie data identifying previously completed *surveys* to avoid presenting a same survey to a user multiple times. Smith, in contrast to Appellants' claimed invention, provides no mechanism for limiting presentations of survey *solicitations*.

For the reasons presented herein, the combined teachings of Smith, de Ment, and Winn do not render the claimed invention obvious.

1. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 11-17, 26-27 and 33 As Obvious Over Smith in View of de Ment

Claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 26, 27, and 33

Appellants request reversal of the final rejection of **claim 1** as obvious over Smith in view of de Ment. The combined disclosures of Smith and de Ment cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness over the presently pending independent claim 1 since a number of the recited elements of claim 1 are simply not present. Such missing elements include: (1) issuing, by the user computer ..., a request to an ad server, for a block of data comprising computer-readable instructions for presenting the on-line advertisement via the browser client; (2) providing, by the ad server, a block of data including instructions facilitating decision-making with regard to whether an *on-line survey solicitation* is presented; (3) accessing a timestamp indicating a time period that has passed since an *online survey solicitation* was presented; and (4) executing the *additional computer-readable instructions*, if the time stamp indicates sufficient time has passed since a last *survey solicitation*, to determine whether to present the on-line survey solicitation via the browser. These points of

distinction were overlooked by the Final Office Action and form a basis for the present appeal.

a. Smith does not disclose the recited “issuing” step

Appellants’ claimed “issuing” step is recited as follows:

“issuing, by the user computer in association with processing the received web page, a request to an ad server, for a block of data comprising computer-readable instructions for presenting the on-line advertisement via the browser”

The “issuing” step (corresponding to Step C in FIG. 1 of Appellant’s application) arises from the user computer processing a received web page and includes sending a request to an ad server. More particularly, the claimed “issuing” step relates to actions taken by the user computer to obtain a block of data from an ad server comprising instructions for presenting an *on-line advertisement* via the user computer’s browser.

Smith does not disclose a user computer issuing a request to an ad server in association with processing a previously received web page. Instead, Smith, at paragraphs 54-55, 58, 118, 122-125, and 145-146 (cited in the Final Office action) discloses banner ads delivered within the initially downloaded web page. Appellants’ interpretation of Smith is bolstered by paragraph [0130] of Smith describing the need to remove the banner from web pages when the survey period ends. In Smith, the banners downloaded in the *initially provided web pages* contain the links to surveys. See also, Smith, paragraph [0058]. There is thus no disclosure in Smith regarding Appellants’ claimed issuing, by a user computer, *a request to an ad server in association with processing a previously received web page*.

b. Smith does not disclose the recited “providing” step

Appellants’ claimed “providing” step is recited as follows:

“providing, by the ad server in response to the issued request from the user computer, the block of data including computer-readable instructions for presenting the on-line advertisement and the block of data further including additional computer-readable instructions that facilitate decision-making steps for determining whether to present an on-line survey solicitation via the browser client”

The “providing” step recites particular additional computer-readable instructions are contained within the block of data provided by the ad server that facilitate decision-making

steps for determining *whether to present* an on-line survey *solicitation* (emphasis added). Thus, the block of data downloaded from the ad server includes instructions for determining whether to present a user with an invitation to take a survey (not the survey itself). Appellants' disclosure (See Fig. 1, Steps J and K and associated written description) unequivocally distinguishes between a solicitation to take a survey and presenting the survey in response to a user's affirmative response to the on-line solicitation.

Smith, in contrast to the aforementioned claim elements relating to presenting a solicitation to take a survey, discloses determining *which survey* a user will be presented. The banner ad containing the survey solicitation is downloaded without regard to any previous exposure by the current user to previous solicitations to take a survey. The Final Office Action has thus identified portions of Smith relating to *selecting a particular survey* rather than determining *whether to present an on-line survey solicitation via the browser client*. The Final Office Action has also not identified any disclosure within Smith directed to providing the additional instructions via an Ad Server in response to a request issued by the user computer (see, "issuing" step discussed above). Therefore, Smith does not disclose the recited "providing" step – in particular as it relates to the previously discussed "issuing" step.

c. Smith, in combination with de Ment, does not disclose the recited "accessing" step

Appellants' claimed "accessing" step is recited as follows:

"accessing, on the user computer, a timestamp value indicative of a period of time that has passed since the on-line survey solicitation was previously presented by the browser client"

The "accessing" step recites the additional action of reading a timestamp value to determine a period of time that has passed since a user was last *solicited to take a survey*. The accessing step thus ensures that an unwilling user will not receive repeated *solicitations to take a survey*.

In contrast to the recited "accessing" step, Smith discloses reading a cookie to determine whether a user has *taken a survey*. Smith is therefore directed to preventing users from taking multiple surveys of a same type. In such cases, it is unlikely that the survey administrator would ever want a user to take a particular survey more than one time. Therefore, a *timestamp*, disclosed in de Ment, would not be considered useful in Smith's on-line survey presentation method because merely noting the survey was taken is sufficient to

prevent users from taking a survey multiple times. For this additional reason the combined teachings of Smith and de Ment do not render the claimed invention obvious.

d. Smith, in combination with de Ment, does not disclose the recited "executing the additional ... instructions" step

Appellants' claimed "executing" step is recited as follows:

"executing the additional computer-readable instructions if the timestamp value indicates passage of a period of time satisfying a prescribed wait period between consecutive presentations of the on-line survey solicitation by the browser client on the user computer"

Appellants claimed "additional computer-readable instructions" are embedded within a downloaded *block of data from an ad server* and "facilitate decision-making steps for determining whether to present an on-line survey solicitation via the browser client." The "executing" step, taken in combination with the previously recited "issuing", "providing", and "accessing" steps, requires: (1) downloading, within an ad data block from an ad server, additional instructions for determining *whether* to present an *on-line survey solicitation*, and (2) executing the additional instructions if a timestamp accessed on the user computer indicates a sufficient period of time has passed since a previous *on-line survey solicitation*.

The Final Office Action, in the discussion beginning at the top of page 4, seeks to identify portions of de Ment corresponding to the claimed "executing" step and then justify the combination of Smith and de Ment. However, the Final Office Action does not identify any teaching in de Ment or Smith that corresponds to the recited time stamp identifying a period of time that has passed since an "on-line survey solicitation." De Ment instead measures a time period since a last *survey* was presented to a user.

Moreover, de Ment's "decision step 216" does not lead to execution of additional instructions embedded within a *data block downloaded from an ad server*. In fact, neither Smith nor de Ment discloses such instructions being downloaded in a data block from an ad server. **In the event the rejection is not withdrawn/reversed, Appellants specifically request identification of a teaching within either Smith or de Ment that such additional instructions are downloaded in a data block from an ad server.**

Appellants have identified several elements of **claim 1** that are simply not disclosed in either Smith or de Ment. Furthermore, the Final Office Action does not present a reasonable motivation for one skilled in the art to modify Smith to include a timestamp (indicating the

last time a user participated in a survey) since Smith does not indicate any desirability in having users retake a survey (and in fact discloses just the opposite). The rejection of **claim 1** as obvious over Smith in view of de Ment should be reversed.

Appellants seek reversal of the other independent and dependent claims grouped with claim 1 (including each of the independent claims) in this section for at least the reasons recited for claim 1.

Claim 6

Appellants specifically seek reversal of the rejection of **claim 6**. Both Smith and de Ment record actual completions of surveys. Neither Smith nor de Ment discloses storing a cookie indicating that a survey solicitation was presented on the user computer. Smith and de Ment disclose systems that prevent a user from taking the same survey multiple times, but neither reference discloses a need to limit repeated *solicitations to take a survey* or address such need by recording a timestamp indicating when a user was previously solicited to take a survey.

Claims 7 and 15

Appellants specifically seek reversal of the rejection of **claims 7 and 15**. Claims 7 and 15 recite elements relating to “on-line survey solicitations” which are different from actual “surveys” completed by users. Appellants furthermore note that paragraphs [0129-0130] of Smith disclose limiting a “quantity” of surveys taken by a particular user rather than a “frequency” (how often) with which solicitations are presented to a particular user computer.

Claim 11

Appellants specifically seek reversal of the rejection of **claim 11**. Neither Smith nor de Ment discloses linking the survey questions to a product or service advertised in the on-line advertisement provided in the block of data downloaded from the ad server. The portions of de Ment referenced at page 7 of the Final Office Action neither discloses nor suggests the survey questions are linked to an *on-line advertisement* contained within the previously provided block of data from the ad server.

Claim 17

Appellants specifically seek reversal of the rejection of **claim 17**. The rejection of claim 1 did not distinguish between initially downloaded web pages and a subsequent request for an ad block by a user computer from an advertisement server. In the event the rejection of claim 17 is not withdrawn/reversed Appellants specifically request: (1) identification of the recited advertisement server, and (2) application of Smith and de Ment to the recited requesting and sending steps.

2. Rejection of Claims 8-10, 21-24, and 28-32 As Obvious Over Smith in View of de Ment and Winn

Claims 8-10, 21-24, and 28-31

Appellants request reversal of the final rejection of **claim 8** as obvious over Smith in view of de Ment and Winn. The Final Office Action does not identify any teaching in any of the three cited references directed to Appellants' claimed element of changing a frequency parameter in accordance with an amount of time remaining in a campaign. See, claims 8 and 9. The Final Office Action states, without confirmation in the teachings of the prior art, that changing the frequency in response to the amount of time remaining in a campaign leads to *more efficiently gathering information*. See Final Office Action, page 11, lines 4-7. Appellants submit there are many ways to ensure that a sufficient number of surveys are taken (increasing ads linked to surveys, expanding survey time frames, calculating a higher frequency value from the beginning, relaxing stringency of candidate selections, increasing values of rewards for taking a survey, etc.).

The Final Office Action has not provided a single reference supporting its bald assertion at page 11, lines 4-7, that Appellants' claimed time-based frequency determination improves information gathering. Appellants submit that the time-based frequency parameter determination does not necessarily improve information gathering. Rather, such adjustment potentially leads to an undesirably high frequency value arising from a need to meet a specific campaign deadline. There are many factors that can potentially be used to dynamically specify the frequency parameter. The Final Office Action, at page 11, lines 6-7, does not explain how changing the frequency over time defines "the goals and objectives of the data to be collected" which, in turn, enables a survey campaign administrator to "more

efficiently gather information from users.” The rejection of claim 8 is instead the product of a hindsight deconstruction of Appellants’ claimed invention.


Claim 32

Appellants specifically seek reversal of the rejection of claim 32 as obvious over Smith in view of de Ment, Winn and Official Notice. URLs are indeed well known. However, nowhere in the cited references is there a suggestion to append the randomly generated value to the URL address identifying the location of the sender of a survey request to the survey logic server that ultimately determines whether to provide the survey to the requesting user computer. The Final Office Action merely states that appending a random number to the sender’s URL efficiently links the sender to the survey logic server. However, there is no citation to the prior art supporting this bald assertion. The rejection of claim 32 is another case of using impermissible hindsight to guide a determination of “obviousness”. **Appellants request identification of a reference in support of this rejection in the event the rejection of claim 32 is not withdrawn/reversed.**

Conclusion

The claimed invention facilitates resubmitting, to a user computer, an invitation to take a survey assuming a sufficient amount of time has passed since a previous *solicitation to take a survey*. Appellants have identified substantial differences between the invention recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 17 and the disclosure of the references cited in the Final Office Action. The dependent claim elements address “dynamic” aspects of the disclosed survey method/system that facilitate “tuning” a survey campaign. None of these advantageous aspects of the claimed invention are disclosed or suggested in the cited references. Thus, Appellants request withdrawal/reversal of the obviousness rejection of each of the presently pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Joy, Reg. No. 35,562
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza
180 North Stetson Ave., Suite 4900
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: November 20, 2008

2113672ndAmendedAppBrief

Claims Appendix

1. A method for conducting an on-line survey in association with presentation of an on-line advertisement by a browser client, the method comprising:

receiving, by a user computer hosting the browser client, a web page configured to display an on-line advertisement;

issuing, by the user computer in association with processing the received web page, a request to an ad server, for a block of data comprising computer-readable instructions for presenting the on-line advertisement via the browser client;

providing, by the ad server in response to the issued request from the user computer, the block of data including computer-readable instructions for presenting the on-line advertisement and the block of data further including additional computer-readable instructions that facilitate decision-making steps for determining whether to present an on-line survey solicitation via the browser client;

accessing, on the user computer, a timestamp value indicative of a period of time that has passed since the on-line survey solicitation was previously presented by the browser client; and

executing the additional computer-readable instructions if the timestamp value indicates passage of a period of time satisfying a prescribed wait period between consecutive presentations of the on-line survey solicitation by the browser client on the user computer.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the accessing step comprises receiving cookie data from the browser client indicative of a previous presentation of the on-line survey solicitation.

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising sending the block of data, including the additional computer-readable instructions, to the browser client over a computer network.

6. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

presenting the on-line survey solicitation thereby soliciting the user to take the on-line survey,

generating, in association with the presenting step, cookie data including the timestamp value to indicate that the on-line survey solicitation was presented by the browser client; and

sending the generated cookie data over a computer network to the browser client.

7. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

executing the additional computer-readable instructions to perform steps of:

referencing a frequency parameter that influences the frequency of presenting the on-line survey solicitations; and

determining whether or not to present the on-line survey solicitation via the browser client based, in part, on the frequency parameter.

8. The method of claim 7, wherein the on-line survey solicitation is presented as part of a campaign, wherein the frequency parameter has a value that is at least partially a function of an amount of time remaining in the campaign, the method further comprising calculating the value of the frequency parameter according to an algorithm that incorporates the amount of time remaining in the campaign.

9. The method of claim 7, wherein the on-line survey solicitation is presented as part of a campaign, wherein the frequency parameter has a value that is at least partially a function of an amount of time remaining in the campaign, the method further comprising determining the value of the frequency parameter by referencing a look-up table that correlates a plurality of possible times remaining in the campaign with corresponding possible frequency values.

10. The method of claim 1, further comprising executing the additional computer-readable instructions to perform steps of:

generating a random number;

determining whether the random number falls within a set of numbers that correspond to a frequency with which the on-line survey solicitation is presented via browser clients;
and

presenting the on-line survey solicitation based on the determining step.

11. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

presenting the on-line survey solicitation as a pop-up window; and

in response to activation of a link within the pop-up window, sending a web page to the browser client comprising questions regarding a product or service advertised in the on-line advertisement.

12. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

presenting the on-line survey solicitation as a pop-up window; and

in response to activation of a link within the pop-up window, sending a web page to the browser client comprising questions regarding a product or service that is not advertised in the on-line advertisement.

13. A method for soliciting a user of a user computer to take an on-line survey, the user computer being linked to a computer network and running a browser program, the method comprising:

receiving, by an advertisement server, a request issued by the browser for one or more files comprising an on-line advertisement;

providing, by the advertisement server to the user compute in response to the request issued by the browser, the one or more files comprising the on-line advertisement and in addition including further computer-readable instructions that facilitate decision-making steps for determining whether to present an on-line survey solicitation via the browser;

accessing, on the user computer, cookie data for the browser including a timestamp regarding previous presentation by the browser of the on-line survey solicitation; and

executing the further computer-readable instructions if the timestamp value indicates passage of a period of time satisfying a prescribed wait period between consecutive solicitations on the user computer to take the on-line survey.

14. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-readable instructions for performing the method of claim 13.

15. The method of claim 13, wherein the one or more requested files comprise computer-readable instructions for displaying the on-line advertisement, and wherein the further computer-readable instructions call a routine that decides whether or not to solicit the user to take the on-line survey based on a frequency parameter, the frequency parameter being indicative of a probability that, in response to the selectively modifying step, the on-line survey solicitation will be submitted for presentation by the browser.

16. The method of claim 15, further comprising:

sending further script to the browser comprising instructions for displaying a pop-up window that, when clicked on by the user, causes the browser to download a web page that includes the on-line survey.

17. A system for conducting an on-line survey, the system comprising:

a client computer for interacting with a user;

a web server in communication with the client computer;

an advertisement server;

a survey logic server in communication with the client computer; and

computer-readable instructions for:

requesting a web page to be sent from the web server to the client computer, the web page including a reference to an on-line advertisement to be presented on the client computer;

requesting, by the client computer the on-line advertisement from the advertisement server for presentation on the client computer; and

sending an on-line survey solicitation associated with the on-line advertisement from the survey logic server to the client computer based at least in part on a stored timestamp value on the client computer indicative of a period of time that has passed since a previous presentation of the on-line survey solicitation on the client computer.

21. The system of claim 17, wherein the sending step comprises:

invoking a routine at the survey logic server that compares a random number to a set of values based on a frequency parameter to determine whether to send the on-line survey solicitation to the client computer.

22. The system of claim 21, wherein the on-line survey solicitation is presented as part of a campaign, and wherein a value of the frequency parameter is at least partially a function of elapsed time in the campaign.

23. The system of claim 22, wherein the frequency parameter is determined according to an algorithm.

24. The system of claim 22, wherein the frequency parameter is determined by referencing a look-up table.

26. The system of claim 17, wherein the advertisement server adds first computer-readable instructions, for invoking a decision routine, to the advertisement data when consideration is to be given to sending the on-line survey solicitation to the computer.

27. The system of claim 26, wherein the survey logic server provides the first computer readable instructions to the ad server.

28. The method of claim 1 wherein the decision-making steps comprise generating a random number on the user computer; and wherein the method further comprises:

applying a frequency parameter value to the random number to determine whether to present a survey invitation on the user computer.

29. The method of claim 28 wherein the frequency parameter value is specified by a survey logic server.

30. The method of claim 29 further comprising the step of changing the frequency parameter value during a survey campaign.

31. The method of claim 29 wherein the executing step comprises providing the random number to the survey logic server, and wherein the survey logic server performs the applying step.

32. The method of claim 31 wherein the random number is appended to a URL used by a browser on the user computer to contact the survey logic server.

33. The method of claim 1 wherein the prescribed wait period is specified by a survey logic server.

Evidence Appendix

Not applicable.

Application No. 09/900,674

Appeal Brief

Related Proceedings Appendix

Not applicable.